



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

*ml*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,864	06/27/2003	Kenneth Carlin Nelson	SVL920030019US1	7075

36380 7590 02/02/2007  
RICHARD M. GOLDMAN  
371 ELAN VILLAGE LANE  
SUITE 208, CA 95134

EXAMINER
----------

DAYE, CHELCIE L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2161

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/02/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/607,864

Applicant(s)

NELSON ET AL.

Examiner

Chelcie Daye

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2161

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is issued in response to applicant's amendment filed December 15, 2006.
2. Claims 1-7 are presented. No claims added and none cancelled.
3. Claims 1-7 are pending.
4. Applicant's arguments filed December 15, 2006, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

5. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 15, 2006 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2161

**7. Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Christfort (US Patent Publication No. 20020138617) filed September 5, 2001.**

Regarding Claims 1 and 6, Christfort discloses a method of rendering an object from a text and numeric centric line of business application to a graphical user interface centric content manager client application comprising:

requesting the object from a text and numeric centric line of business application ([0067], Christfort)<sup>1</sup>;

the line of business application initiating an associated host initiated display application program interface<sup>2</sup> ([0087], lines 4-12, Christfort), and calling a workstation listener ([0094], lines 9-16, Christfort);

a content manager host ([0087], lines 4-12, Christfort) sending customer application request to a workstation listener ([0163], lines 3-9, Christfort);

the workstation listener launching an associated content manager graphical user interface client ([0163], lines 9-17, Christfort)<sup>3</sup>;

the content manager graphical user interface client building a request for the object ([0163], lines 14-17, Christfort, wherein the building process entails receiving the request, linking the request and forwarding the request) and

---

<sup>1</sup> Examiner Notes: The text and numeric centric line of business application corresponds to applications discussed. Paragraph [0063], lines 1-8, provides details about the application and discloses the line of business of the application. Also, paragraphs [0087-0088], disclose the application being written in a code, which discloses the text and numeric aspect of the line of business application.

<sup>2</sup> Examiner Notes: the "development website" is associated with the hosting service (pg. 6, ¶0080, lines 5-8, Christfort), which initiates the software development kit (pg. 6, ¶0081, lines 5-8, Christfort). The SDK further provides the user with an interface.

<sup>3</sup> Examiner Notes: Further details about the functionality of a listener are outlined within paragraphs [0004-0005] of Christfort.

Art Unit: 2161

sending the request to the associated content manager application for the associated host initiated display ([0164 -0165], Christfort); and

the content manager application responding to the graphical user interface centric content manager client and rendering the object from the text and numeric centric line of business application to the graphical user interface centric user ([0167-0168], Christfort).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claims 2-5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christfort (US Patent Publication No. 20020138617) filed September 5, 2001, in view of Moore (US Patent No. 6,223,180) filed October 30, 1998.**

Regarding Claims 2,5, and 7, Christfort discloses a method wherein the requested object (pg.4, ¶0059, lines 4-10, Christfort) is selected from a group consisting of displays (Fig.5, item 512, Christfort). However, Christfort is silent with respect to the group consisting of prints and folder contents. On the other hand, Moore discloses the groups consisting of prints (column 7, lines 16-18, Moore), and folder contents (Fig.2, items 22,23,24; column 4, lines 62-65, Moore; wherein the partitions in the repository is a directory where files are stored). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Moore's teaching into the Christfort system. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so in order to allow the user a wider range of options. As a result, this optimized the choices, which are available thus ultimately bringing more appeal to the user.

Regarding Claim 3, the combination of Christfort in view of Moore, disclose a computer system comprising graphical user interface centric content manager client application (Fig.4, item 410, Christfort), a resource manager ([0004], lines 3-7, Christfort; wherein the resource manager corresponds to URL), a library server (Fig.2, item 26, Moore) and a text and numeric centric line of business application ([0067], Christfort), and a host initiated display application program interface between the line of business application and the interface centric content manager client application (Fig.1, Christfort).

Regarding Claim 4, the combination of Christfort in view of Moore, disclose a computer system adapted to render an object from a text and numeric centric line of business application to a graphical user interface centric client application by the steps of:

requesting the object from a text and numeric centric line of business application ([0067], Christfort);

the text and numeric centric line of business application initiating an associated host initiated display application program interface ([0087], lines 4-12, Christfort), and calling a workstation listener ([0094], lines 9-16, Christfort);

a content manager host ([0087], lines 4-12, Christfort) sending customer application request to a workstation listener ([0163], lines 3-9, Christfort);

the workstation listener launching an associated content manager graphical user interface client ([0163], lines 9-17, Christfort);

the content manager graphical user interface client building a request for the object ([0163], lines 14-17, Christfort, wherein the building process entails receiving the request, linking the request and forwarding the request) and sending the request to the associated content manager application for the associated host initiated display ([0164 –0165], Christfort); and

the content manager application responding to the graphical user interface centric content manager client and rendering the object from the text and numeric centric line of business application to the graphical user interface centric user ([0166-0168], Christfort).

**Response to Arguments**

*Applicant argues, Christfort paragraph [0087] is not applicant's claimed "method of rendering an object from a text and numeric centric line of business application to a graphical user interface centric content manager client application", "nor is it the hosted application of [0091] or [0094]".*

Examiner respectfully disagrees. In regards to applicant's arguments with respect to paragraphs [0087] disclosing the limitation within the preamble, are moot on the grounds that paragraph [0087] was not relied upon to disclose such specific features of the claim. Also, applicant's argument in regards to paragraphs [0091] and [0094] with respect to not disclosing the hosted application is moot on the grounds that paragraphs [0091] and [0094] were not relied upon for disclosure of the specific feature mentioned.

*Applicant argues, Christfort's citation of paragraph [0163] for teaching "sending a customer application request to a workstation listener, for launching an associated content manager graphical user interface application, and building a request for an object" uses similar words and phrases, but describes a materially different process than applicant's claimed process, and there is no disclosure of applicant's newly amended limitation of "rendering an object from a text and numeric centric line of business application to a graphical user interface centric content manager client application".*

Examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated in the applicant's specification at paragraph [0013], "a listener is a software module or application used to facilitate the association between a connection and a destination, more specifically, a listener starts



Art Unit: 2161

a service on a received command, and provides an appropriate link". The listener described within the Christfort reference at paragraphs [0004-0005] is used when a user of a browser selects a link on an HTML page, the browser sends a request over the Internet to the listener associated with the URL specified in the link, and in response to the request, the listener transmits the requested information to the browser that issued the request. As such, examiner believes the functionality of the described listener within the present application to correspond with the functionality of the Christfort listener. In regards to applicant's argument of no disclosure being made to the newly amended claimed limitation of "rendering an object from a text and numeric centric line of business application to a graphical user interface centric content manager client application", is moot on the grounds of a new rejection.

*Applicant argues, Christfort describes a "style sheet" dependent solution and thus Christfort proposes an inapplicable solution to an inapplicable problem, and is not a proper reference.*

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The objective of the present application is to transparently invoke a graphics centric end user application from a text and numeric centric application. The objective of the Christfort reference is to provide improved techniques for designing applications that more effectively work with all devices (see paragraphs [0011] and [0021]). As such, examiner believes that the argued "style sheet" solutions are irrelevant with regards to the whole purpose and functionality of the Christfort reference. The Christfort reference is deemed to be within the same field of

Art Unit: 2161

endeavor as the present application and provides the same features and functionality as the present application.

*Applicant argues, Moore does not teach applicant's claimed "graphical user interface centric application".*

Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Therefore, with regards to applicant's argument above, the Moore reference was not solely relied upon for the disclosure of the limitation of a graphical user interface centric application. However, the Christfort reference was relied for the disclosure of such limitation and is outlined within the office action above.

Art Unit: 2161

***Points of Contact***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chelcie Daye whose telephone number is 571-272-3891. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chelcie Daye  
Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2100  
January 29, 2007

*Apu Mofiz*  
Apu Mofiz  
Supervisor, Art Unit 2161